SOUTHER	TATES DISTRICT COURT IN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK						
JUAN PED	RAZA,	X					
	Plaintif	23-CV-2596 (VF)					
	-against-	<u>ORDER</u>					
THE MONS d/b/a SPUN	TAN MONSTER INC. d/b/a STER BAR, SPUNK EVENTS II K INC., CHARLES RAYMONI OBEY, and JOSE LUIS LEPE,						
	Defend						
	FIGUEREDO, United States M						
Atta	ched to this Order are the followi	ng Court Exhibits:					
• Exhib	oit D: The jury verdict.						
SO ORDERED.							
DATED:	New York, New York January 13, 2025	VALERIE FIGUEREDO					
		United States Magistrate Judge					

EXHIBIT D

UNITE	HERN	I D	ISTRI	CT O	NEW	YOR			70									
JUAN	N PEDI			1 607 tin lin ha 100 til lin	ant was now man aire aire aire a	a total day has the use any san			X									
						Plai	ntiff,							23	-CV	-259	6 (VI	7)
-agains	st-																	
THE I	MONS SPUN	STI IK I	ER BA	R, SP		EVENT AYM	TS INC OND R PE,		Ε,									
							efenda	nts										
							s Mag	istr	ate	Ju	dge							
			A	<u>P</u> All jurc	LEASE ors mus	CHE agree	CK (von the	ans	YOU swer	JR s t	AN o all	SWE the	RS ques	tion	s.			
I.	Disc	rin	ninatio	n Bas	ed on (Gende	r unde	r T	itle `	VI	Ī							
	1.]	Do yo	ı find	from a	prepon	nderanc	e of	f the	ev	ridei	nce th	at M	Ianh	atta	n Mo	nster	Inc.
create	d or m	nain	tained	a seve	ere or p	ervasiv	ve hosti	ile v	work	eı	nvir	onme	nt o	n the	e bas	sis of	Mr.	
Pedraz	za's ge	ende	er?							,	V							
					YES		_		NO)_	<u></u>							
II.	Disci	rim	inatio	n Bas	ed on S	sexual	Orien	tati	on 1	ine	der	Title	VII					
	1.	I	Do you	i find	from a j	prepon	deranc	e o	f the	ev	ride	nce tl	nat N	Man	hatta	an M	onste	er Inc.
create	d or m	ain	tained	a seve	ere or p	ervasiv	ve hosti	ile v	vork	c ei	nvir	onme	ent o	n th	e ba	sis o	f Mr.	
Pedraz	za's pe	erce	eived s	exual	orientat	ion?												
					YES				NO)_	X							

III. Discrimination Based on Gender under NYCHRL

- 1. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Manhattan Monster Inc. created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's gender?

 YES

 NO
 - 2. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Spunk Events Inc. created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's gender?

 YES

 NO

 YES

 NO
 - 3. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Charles Raymond Rice created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's gender?
 - 4. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Daniel Tobey created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's gender?
 - 5. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Jose Luis Lepe created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's gender?

 YES

 NO

IV. <u>Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation under NYCHRL</u>

1. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Manhattan Monster Inc.
created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or
trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's perceived sexual orientation?
YES NO
2. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Spunk Events Inc. created
or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial
inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's perceived sexual prientation?
YES NO
3. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Charles Raymond Rice
created or maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or
trivial inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's perceived sexual orientation?
YES NO
4. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Daniel Tobey created or
maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial
inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's perceived sexual orientation?
YES NO
5. Do you find from a preponderance of the evidence that Jose Luis Lepe created or
maintained a hostile work environment that amounts to more than petty slights or trivial
inconveniences on the basis of Mr. Pedraza's perceived sexual orientation?
YES NO V

V. Retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

	1.	Has Mr. Pedraza proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Manha	ittan
Mon	ster Inc.	subjected him to a retaliatory adverse employment action in the form of	
cons	tructive	discharge based on his protected activity in violation of Title VII?	
		YES NO V	

VI. Retaliation under NYCHRL

- 1. Has Mr. Pedraza proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he was subjected to retaliatory adverse employment action in the form of constructive discharge based on his protected activity in violation of NYCHRL?
 - a) By Manhattan Monster Inc.?

 YES _____ NO____

YES

b) By Charles Raymond Rice? [You may only answer YES to this question if you answered YES to Question No. VI (1)(a) above]

NO

- c) By Daniel Tobey? [You may only answer YES to this question if you answered YES to Question No. VI (1)(a) above]

 YES NO
- d) By Jose Luis Lepe? [You may only answer YES to this question if you answered YES to Question No. VI (1)(a) above]

VII. Damages

The following questions need only be answered if you answered YES to one or more of the prior

questions.	
1. Has Mr. Pedraza proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he is entitled	l to
back pay, as a result of the Defendants' discrimination against him and/or retaliatory construct	tive
discharge of his employment?	
YES NO	
2. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (1), state below the amount that is to b	е
awarded in back pay. If you answered "NO" to Question VII (1), proceed to Question VII (3).	
\$	
3. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts V through VI, do you find that	at
Mr. Pedraza has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he is entitled to front pay as	a
result of the discrimination against him and/or retaliatory constructive discharge of his	
employment?	
YES NO	
1/3/DGM (O _ 1' - VIII (2)) state below the amount that is to be	10

4. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (3), state below the amount that is to be awarded in front pay. If you answered "NO" to Question VII (3), proceed to Question VII (5).

5. Do you find that Mr. Pedraza has proven, by a preponderance of evidence, that he is entitled to compensatory damages for pain, suffering or emotional distress that he experienced as a result of the discrimination against him and/or retaliatory constructive discharge of his

YES _____ NO____

employment?

6. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (5), state below the amount that is to be
awarded in compensatory damages for pain, suffering, or emotional distress. If you answered
"NO" to Question VII (5), proceed to Question VII (7).
\$
7. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts I through VI, do you find that
Defendant, Manhattan Monster Inc., should be subject to punitive damages?
YES NO
8. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (7), state below the amount of punitive
damages, if any, that you award to Plaintiff:
\$
9. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts I through VI, do you find that
Defendant, Spunk Events Inc., should be subject to punitive damages?
YES NO
10. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (9), state below the amount of punitive
damages, if any, that you award to Plaintiff:
\$
11. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts I through VI, do you find that
Defendant, Charles Raymond Rice, should be subject to punitive damages?
YES NO
12. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (11), state below the amount of punitive
damages, if any, that you award to Plaintiff:
\$

Case 1:23-cv-02596-VF Document 143 Filed 01/13/25 Page 9 of 10

13. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts I through VI, do you find that Defendant, Daniel Tobey, should be subject to punitive damages?
YES NO 14. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (13), state below the amount of punitive damages, if any, that you award to Plaintiff:
\$ 15. If you answered "YES" to any Questions in Parts I through VI, do you find that Defendant, Jose Luis Lepe, should be subject to punitive damages?
YES NO 16. If you answered "YES" to Question VII (15), state below the amount of punitive damages, if any, that you award to Plaintiff:
\$

Please have the foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form and advise the Court by note that you have reached a verdict.

Dated: New York, New York

1 10, 2025

JANICE ELSKINE

Jury Foreperson